

**REMARKS**

At the outset, the Examiner is thanked for the thorough review and consideration of the pending application. The Office Action dated November 9, 2009 has been received and its contents carefully reviewed.

Claims 13-15, 18-23 and 27-37 are pending. Claims 22 is amended. Claims 27-37 have previously been withdrawn. Accordingly, claims 13-15 and 18-23 remain currently pending for examination in this application. Reexamination and reconsideration of the pending claims is respectfully requested.

In the Office Action, Claims 13-15, 18-19 and 22-23 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,371,324 to Sinoto (hereinafter “Sinoto”) in view of Melles-Griot Optics Catalog (Optics Guide 5) (hereinafter “Melles-Griot”) and U.S. Patent No. 4,624,537 to Hanssen et al. (hereinafter “Hanssen”). Claims 20-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatenable over Sinoto in view of Melles-Griot and Hanssen and in further view of U.S. Patent No. 3,912,920 to Kubota (hereinafter “Kubota”).

The rejection of claims 13-15 and 18-23 are respectfully traversed and reconsideration is requested.

Applicant submits claims 13-15 and 18-23 are allowable in that independent claim 22 recites a combination of elements including, for example, “a plurality of quartz substrate parts, each quartz substrate part comprises one quartz substrate or a plurality of quartz substrates stacked on top of one another; a polarizer holder having a lattice like structure and directly supporting each quartz substrate part, wherein the polarizer holder includes a material having an optical absorptivity of almost 100%, and wherein the polarizer holder absorbs light reflected by the plurality of quartz substrate parts.” However, none of cited references including Sinoto, Melles-Griot, Hanssen and Kubota teaches or suggests these features of the present application.

In the rejection of claim 22, the Examiner states that Sinoto discloses “a plurality of sections (e.g. 20, 22, 24, 26) each section comprising a plurality of transparent substrates (e.g. 28, 30, 32, 34); a polarizer holder (36, opaque border) supporting said plurality of substrate parts.” (see Office Action, page 3). However, Applicants submit Sinoto fails to teach or

suggest each transparent substrate (e.g. 28, 30, 32, or 34) is directly supported by the polarizer holder. Sinoto teaches a plurality of sections (e.g. 20, 22, 24, 26) each section comprising a plurality of transparent substrates (e.g. 28, 30, 32, 34).”

In the rejection of claim 22, the Examiner states that Sinoto discloses that “each transparent substrate part comprises a plurality of substrates stacked on top of one another (e.g. transparent substrates 104 and 106 are stacked)”. But, Applicants submit the plurality of transparent substrates (e.g. 28, 30, 32, 34) of the layers 104 and 106 are supported by the other opaque border (36) of Sinoto. Accordingly, Sinoto fails to teach “a plurality of quartz substrate parts, each quartz substrate part comprises one quartz substrate or a plurality of quartz substrates stacked on top of one another; a polarizer holder having a lattice like structure and directly supporting each quartz substrate part” as recited in claim 22.

Also, claims 13-15 and 18-23 are allowable because there is no suggestion or motivation to combine Sinoto, Melles-Griot and Hanssen Kubota. The mere fact that references can be combined or modified does not render the resultant combination obvious unless the prior art also suggests the desirability of the combination. (MPEP 2143.01 (III)).

Here, Sinoto teaches light-modulating information storage and retrieval system, which uses a light projector 10, an information retrieval slide 12, an information storage unit panel 14 and a read-out board 19 (Fig. 1). Sinoto teaches that information storage unit panel 14 includes a plurality of storage cells 18, and each of the storage cells 18 includes four horizontal arrays 20, 22, 24 and 26 each comprising four tiny squares 28, 30, 32, 34 (Col. 2, lines 41-64).

In contrast, Melles-Griot teaches a lens holder, whereby “[t]he body is black chrome coated to reduce scatter and stray reflections.” Further, the Examiner states that “[i]t would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to make the material of the polarizer holder of Sinoto having an absorptivity almost equal to 100%, as taught by the Melles-Griot catalog.”(Office Action, page 4).

Applicants respectively assert that this feature of Melles-Griot is contradictory to the objective of Sinoto. This is because Sinoto expressly states that its objective is for no light to be lost from either state of polarization. Both polarization components are preserved and used by the light-modulating information storage and retrieval system. This objective would be undermined by a polarizer holder with a highly absorbing material, as suggested by the

Examiner. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that there is no motivation to combine the teaching of Sinoto and Melles-Griot.

Based upon the above discussion, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of claims 13-15 and 18-23.

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

If for any reason the Examiner finds the application other than in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to call the undersigned attorney at (202) 496-7500 to discuss the steps necessary for placing the application in condition for allowance. All correspondence should continue to be sent to the below-listed address.

If these papers are not considered timely filed by the Patent and Trademark Office, then a petition is hereby made under 37 C.F.R. §1.136, and any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for any necessary extension of time, or any other fees required to complete the filing of this response, may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-0911. Please credit any overpayment to deposit Account No. 50-0911.

Dated: February 12, 2010

Respectfully submitted,

/Valerie P. Hayes/  
Valerie P. Hayes  
Registration No.: 53,005  
McKENNA LONG & ALDRIDGE LLP  
1900 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 496-7500  
Attorneys for Applicant